

**North Dakota School for the Deaf
Future Services Plan (FSP) Transition Team
Meeting #2**

Thursday, November 19, 2009

Meeting Goals

- To review and affirm the foundational structure and process for the NDSD Future Services Plan (FSP) Initiative –
 - Use of the consensus-based decision-making process;
 - Operational ground rules and values;
 - Purpose, goals, and expected outcomes of the Future Services Plan Initiative; and
 - General “housekeeping” issues.
- To review, discuss and approve the draft Transition Team Meeting Summary from October 29, 2009;
- To review and discuss the results of the FSP Progressive Survey;
- To review and discuss public input and comments;
- To receive informational presentations regarding components of the educational and service delivery systems for individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing in North Dakota;
- To identify and clarify the challenges, expected outcomes and activities necessary to develop North Dakota’s Future Services Plan for individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing; and
- To identify additional research, data, educational materials, information and presentations needed, and next steps in the Future Services Plan initiative.

Meeting Summary

Participants

Carol Lybeck, Fred Bott, Cindy Wetzel, David Oehlke, Diane Rice, Connie Hovendick, Holly Pedersen, Terry Solheim, James Johnson, Michelle Rolewitz, Larry Robinson, Mike Beck and Cynthia Tastad.

Unable to Attend

Helen Baumgartner.

Resource Staff/Planning Team Attending

Nancy Skorheim, Carmen Grove Suminski, and Bob Rutten.

Interpreters

Renae Bitner and Cathy Obregon.

Facilitated by

The Consensus Council, Inc.

Welcome and Introductions

The participants were welcomed and provided with an orientation to the meeting materials in the packet for Meeting #2. The draft agenda was reviewed and no recommendations for changes were requested. Transition Team members and staff provided self-introductions.

Foundational Structure and Process Review

Transition Team members reviewed and affirmed the consensus-based decision-making process and the established ground rules including:

- It's your show/opportunity.
- Everyone is equal.
- No relevant topic is excluded.
- No discussion is ended.
- Respect opinions.
- Respect the time.
- Keep the facilitator accurate.
- Non-attribution.
- Silence is agreement.
- Media/open meeting.
- Have fun!

Participants reviewed and affirmed the group values including:

- Focus on the people
- Best quality service
- Need-driven, responsive and flexible
- Current, creative leadership
- Respect for laws and regulations
- Fiscal responsibility and good stewardship
- Broad inclusive focus
- Comprehensive approach for adults
- Continuum of services: birth to seniors

The participants engage in further discussion regarding a number of issues:

- Fiscal issues related to the number of students at the NDSD and the associated budget costs - The participants agreed that there must be recognition that services to any special needs group will be more cost intensive than those of the "general public" and the comparison of these costs must be made in that context. Additionally, fiscal efficiencies and responsibility should be approached from a comprehensive perspective. There is data available to quantify costs and this data should be reviewed from the broader perspective. It should also include consideration of "front-loaded" costs and the overall, future return on investment - what is invested or not invested in services today will directly influence future (generations) outcomes.

- Scheduling a Transition Team meeting or meetings at the NDSD in Devils Lake - The Transition Team noted its respect for the NDSD and the quality of its personnel and services. They indicated that it would be valuable for the Transition Team to experience a "sense of place" as they continue their work and visiting the school and meeting the staff and students will also help to provide an important perspective regarding the physical campus, the buildings and grounds. Holding a meeting in Devils Lake might also allow for greater community input from the city and region. The Transition Team agreed that it needs to address the role of the school as a future resource for the entire state and this may be better accomplished if Transition Team members have an opportunity to be on site at NDSD. It was agreed that the Transition Team would hold at least one meeting at the NDSD (December) with an option of holding additional meetings there in the future. It was further agreed that the meeting should begin at 8:00 a.m. and that some of the presentations/materials specific to NDSD could be arranged for at the meeting in Devils Lake. The Planning Team was asked to make the arrangements.
- The same quality of place and service can be found in public school mainstream situations - There was dialogue regarding the ability to adequately serve students with multiple, complex disabilities in a mainstream setting. It was agreed that there is no one answer or easy answer to this question. Services vary from community to community, but parents and students want to have choices in services based on their specific and unique needs, and this relates directly to the common value of creating and enhancing a continuum of services.
- The need for more than just "good intentions" to educate students with special needs - Teachers trained or certified in deaf education generally have sufficient background knowledge/education to address the unique needs of individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing. However, this is not necessarily true of mainstream educators and others. Although they may have the best of intentions, they may be unprepared to provide services at the specific level needed. Care should be exercised in making decisions that will impact generations to come.
- Transition Team meeting(s) at the ND School for the Blind in Grand Forks - North Dakota Vision Services and the School for the Blind have been suggested as a potential model for consideration by the Transition Team. A site visit to the Grand Forks campus was suggested to potentially help the Team members to learn more about the services and provide a better opportunity for community input. The Transition Team asked the Planning Team to make the necessary arrangements for a separate meeting (January?) in Grand Forks.
- Access and availability of services - The Transition Team members discussed the fact that there are many factors that impact and influence the type and quality of services available and accessible to individuals and families and these factors may depend upon where they reside in the state, with urban vs. rural locations apparently having the most direct influence. As a result, the Transition Team agreed to add an additional

“Reasonable/Equal access to and availability of services” to their list of values.

Review and Approval of the Draft Transition Team Meeting Summary of October 29, 2009

Transition Team members reviewed and discussed the draft version of the meeting summary from Meeting #1 on October 29, 2009. A correction will be made to page 10 clarifying the outreach services at the ND School for the Blind.

It was pointed out that there was a reference made by Gary Gronberg during his presentation regarding a Letter to the Editor from Senator John Andrist that was to be shared with Transition Team members that they have not yet received (Dr. Sanstead’s response to the letter had been included with the original presentation materials). The Planning Team was asked to follow-up on this.

There were no other comments or suggested edits. The Consensus Council will make these revisions and the summary for Meeting #1 will be accepted as the final iteration and posted as such on the website.

In the future, draft meeting summaries will be completed by the Consensus Council as soon as possible following each meeting. This initial draft will be distributed to all of the Transition Team members who will be asked to supply any suggested edits or corrections (utilizing the “reply all” option) to the Consensus Council within a two-day timeframe. The corrected iteration will then be posted as a draft on the website. The Transition Team will finalize the draft during its next meeting. The goal of this process is to have an accurate draft of the meeting summary posted for all interested parties within 7 to 10 days of each meeting. *Note: Transition Team members are asked to use the “reply all” option in their emails whenever they are communicating regarding process issues or concerns. It is hoped that this approach will not only increase the efficiency of the group’s communications, but will also reinforce transparency and inclusion.*

Review of the Results of the FSP Progressive Survey

The initial responses to the progressive survey and how it will be used in the future were reviewed with the participants.

Review and Discussion of Public Input and Comments

The process for public input and comment was reviewed. It was noted that to date, only one response has been received through the website and there has been no public attendance or input through the meeting(s). The Transition Team members’ role in representing their specific constituencies and the public was discussed and Team members were encouraged to serve as an active, two-way conduit for comments, ideas and thoughts. Team members were asked to share any input that they had received and the following points were made:

- University staff and faculty are supportive of the recruitment, training and retention of qualified professionals and wish to assist in any way possible.

- Senior citizens have identified concerns regarding the lack of availability to quality hearing aids and the training of consumers in their use and adjustment.
- NDSD alumni have expressed their desire to see the NDSD expand its role in the provision of human services to address the increasing needs of adults who are deaf or hard of hearing. There is a degree of uncertainty regarding whether such an effort can be accomplished under the auspices of DPI or perhaps a cooperative effort with the Department of Human Services and/or other agencies. The specific services need to be defined and clarified. It was noted that there are agreements already in place between the NDSD and other service providers to make supplemental services available cooperatively. The NDSD does not intend to compete with or duplicate services that are already available.
- There continues to be a lack of services available to/for deaf and hard of hearing adults in the state. Transition Team members agreed that the challenges of dealing with a diverse adult population are no different than the complexity of dealing with the diverse needs of children. There are differing needs and responses for those with lifelong deafness and those who are losing hearing gradually, such as the aging population.
- There are outreach opportunities to help the mainstream community become better educated about the needs of people who are deaf and hard of hearing resulting in better acceptance and integration as both groups go about their day-to-day community life.
- There appear to be more comprehensive services available for adults who are deaf or hard of hearing in Minnesota (and other states). These include, but are not limited to vocational training and job placement, mental health and other support services. Some deaf individuals have chosen to live in Minnesota because they can access/receive better services. There is a support group in Fargo, jointly sponsored by the NDSD Fargo Outreach and Minnesota Hearing Services (located in Moorhead, MN), that is available to both North Dakota and Minnesota residents who are experiencing hearing loss. Information from Minnesota (or other states) may be valuable as a best practices model for consideration and the Transition Team asked the Planning Team to explore a relevant presentation.
- Options, Inc., a Center for Independent Living (CIL) based in Grand Forks will soon be opening a branch office in Devils Lake and they may be able to provide some services. It was reported that although there are four (4) CILs covering the state, the level of their service and their focus might not be a good "fit" for people who are deaf and hard of hearing because CIL staff are not experienced or trained in deaf issues and services. Additionally, CILs do not provide direct services. It was noted that this is an example of good intentions, but it might not be an acceptable answer/option. Human service professionals often do not have the specialized communication skills needed to work with individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing.
- There is a need to have data that identifies how many adults with hearing loss are un-served/under-served in North Dakota and the extent of their

needs (population profiles). This data should be compared with services in other states to determine how services can be developed, improved or enhanced in North Dakota.

Informational Presentations

- **Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 2004**

Robert Rutten, Director of Special Education, ND Department of Public Instruction thanked participants for their candor regarding the Transition Team process and assured them that the Planning Team would take the recommendations made by Team members into account as planning continues.

He provided the group with a Power Point presentation (handed out) on the IDEA specific to children under the age of 21 and made the following points:

- This is America's law - many countries have no such law;
- The civil rights movement of the 1950's and 1960's caused other movements, specific to minority groups, to follow, including IDEA;
- PL 94-142 passed in 1975;
- Prior to PL 94-142, parents of children who had disabilities had to pay for private education - many North Dakotans will remember the lack of access to public education of a friend, relative or neighbor;
- IDEA is not just theory - it is a law - with major principles that have, and continue to positively impact American children;
- Part B focuses on students age 3-21, and Part C deals with birth to 3 (these early intervention services are provided through the Department of Human Services).

There are six key principles of the IDEA:

1. Zero Reject
2. Evaluation
3. Appropriate Education
4. Least Restrictive Appropriate Educational Placement (LRE)
5. Procedural Due Process
6. Parent Participation and Shared Decision Making

The participants discussed the presentation, asked some questions and made several comments:

- Concerns were raised regarding the ability of the special education units to provide the services outlined in the law and/or needed by individual students.
- The law is lengthy and specific, but it is open to continuing interpretation, especially regarding "appropriate" vs. "best."
- Team members wanted to know how many school districts do not have the services of a deaf educator available to them?
- When considering deaf education, "good enough" is not good enough.
- The law says that a free, appropriate, public education (FAPE) should be available (and accessible) to all children. Availability and accessibility are critical issues, but they are affected and often controlled by cost.

- Because of the demographics and budget issues, schools have increasing difficulty recruiting and retaining qualified professionals at all levels, including deaf educators.
 - Care needs to be taken in defining expectations - expectations regarding our education system and our students. Low expectations encourage/breed low outcomes. Our expectations can be higher, but then we have to find ways to help the schools and students meet those expectations.
 - All children have individual needs. Sometimes, people think that only children with disabilities have individualized (special) needs.
 - The current situation regarding deaf education is not unique to North Dakota. These issues are facing other low population states.
 - NDSB has traditionally provided opportunities for students to receive specific vocational training and experience. This type of opportunity has not been available through other service providers.
 - The state has an historical pattern of providing specialized schools (NDSB, NDSB, CCS, etc.) for children affected by specific disabilities. Currently, there is a major increase (500+) in the number of children diagnosed with autism, but there is currently no special school, or plans for one that anyone is aware of.
- **IDEA 2004 – Unique Factors Relating to School Age Children Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing** - Nancy Skorheim, Regional Coordinator, ND Department of Public Instruction/Office of Special Education
Due to time constraints, it was agreed that this presentation would be provided at a subsequent meeting.
 - **No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Federal Law** – Laurie Matzke, Title I Director, ND Department of Public Instruction, provided an overview (with handout) to the participants regarding NCLB. Ms. Matzke noted that:
 - Regardless of what people may think about the law, it has made some very positive changes in public school special education in North Dakota.
 - Parents continue to contact DPI routinely requesting assistance because their child “has been left behind.”
 - The reauthorization of NCLB has been delayed for various reasons, including the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), but it is hoped that reauthorization will occur in the fall of 2010.

Laurie provided an overview of the Federal Education Act as well as the key elements of NCLB including:

1. Accountability for results
2. Emphasis on doing what works, based on scientific research
3. Expanded parental options
4. Expanded local control and flexibility

Other presentation highlights included:

- Federal Title Programs Review
- Teacher Quality Provision

- Aide/Paraprofessional Requirements
- State Assessment
- Accountability/Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
- Program Improvement

The participants discussed "Adequate Yearly Progress" (AYP) and how it is measured in small rural schools. It was reported that any group of 10 or fewer do not have to report information in the same manner as the larger schools due to the potential that an individual student's identity may be compromised. Additionally, DPI's assessments cover a period of three years and schools may not exclude any student(s) from taking the state assessment - no exemptions. However, if a student has been in school for less than one year, his/her scores are not counted, and students with an Individual Education Plan (IEP) may take an alternative test. Schools that have not had 95% of students take the test will automatically not meet AYP. AYP is optional in private schools.

Overall progress on NCLB requirements in North Dakota is planned and measured in three-year increments (it is done annually in some states). Additionally, North Dakota has chosen to do its testing each year in the fall. This testing is for the previous year and this approach carries with it both positive and negative concerns.

Program Improvement Plans (only schools receiving Title I funds can have one - 312 total out of 465 school districts in ND) for schools not meeting AYP, the sanctions, associated progress timelines, and a description of how needed corrections are proposed to be accomplished (as dictated by North Dakota law) were also reviewed and discussed. Reports are calculated in an aggregate fashion by a school district rather than by individual building.

DPI is required to create a report card for each school district, which must be shared with the public. Parents must be specifically notified of the availability of the report and afforded the names of all instructional staff.

There is a tendency for students with special needs to "migrate" to larger school districts because services are available. This creates some concerns relative to open enrollment policies.

It was noted that the most difficult category for schools to achieve acceptable AYP is for those students who have a disability.

Aging Services – Service and Eligibility Requirements/ Federal and State Laws

MariDon Sorum, Regional Aging Services Program Administrator from the ND Department of Human Services (Minot Region II) provided an overview of the "Graying of North Dakota," (handout) including the following highlights:

- Population 60 and over is about 30% in North Dakota;

- Those aged 85 and older are the fastest growing population in North Dakota; and
- There is not enough funding to serve all those who are in need.

Lynn Jacobson of the State Office of Aging provided an overview of services (handout) provided to those 60 and over by the ND DHS including:

- The Older Americans Act dictates that people over 60 can be served;
- Meals on Wheels and Congregate Meals;
- Transportation Services;
- Specialized Equipment/Assistive Devices through the Interagency Program for Assistive technology (IPAT);
 - The budget for this program is approximately \$180,000 every 2 years and has never been sufficient to meet all of the needs; and
 - IPAT also recycles non-working and/or out-of-date equipment.
- Telecommunication Equipment (ND phone bills include a \$1 monthly charge. These funds are used to provide telecommunication devices to deaf and hard of hearing citizens (This program started by Transition Team members James Johnson).

Ms. Jacobson indicated that eligibility for Medicaid is required to qualify for some programs and stressed the difficulties in general communication and specifically in sharing service and program information with seniors who are deaf or hard of hearing due to a shortage of interpreters to serve in this role. It was noted that it would be helpful if people who are deaf or hard of hearing were targeted for receipt of information, and that interpreters should be required at DHS and other public meetings.

The "Graying of ND" references material cited in the "Aging Baby Boomers Becoming the Senior Boomers," a report prepared by the Department of Human Services and/or NDSU State Data Center. Mike Beck volunteered to locate the study and provide the citation to the Consensus Council for sharing with the Transition Team.

• **Vocational Rehabilitation – Service and Eligibility Requirements**

Mike Beck, Regional Vision Specialist from VR provided an overview of VR including the following:

- Mike distributed and reviewed the Report from the State Rehabilitation Council to the Governor for FY 2008 and noted that an updated report will be published in February 2010 reflecting data from FY 2009.
- Eligibility for VR services are based on establishing the existence of a physical or mental impairment that is a substantial impediment to employment and the expectation of employment upon provision of services.
- Individuals must have exited the school system (generally graduation or age 21 unless they are receiving transition services from VR) with no upper limit on age, although to be eligible and individual must have a vocational goal.

- There is also a specific program for people with visual disabilities who are 55 years old or older. This group is not required to have a vocational goal.
- Vocational Rehabilitation's goal is to make an eligibility determination within sixty days. However, because of increasing applicant numbers and the extensive amount of information that must be gathered, this timeline may be longer.
- During the sixty-day determination period a great deal of information must be gathered from the client, the family, various medical providers and others. This process must be completed before a VR counselor can make a determination of eligibility.
- Upon determination that an individual is eligible for services, that individual and his/her VR counselor will develop an Individual Employment Plan (IEP).
- In 2008, 121 people in ND were successfully placed in employment. This number reflects successful placements and not the total number of individuals served – that number is significantly higher.

During the follow-up discussion, it was noted that people who are deaf do not consider themselves to have either a physical or mental disability, and it was agreed that there could be better terminology used to describe these eligibility requirements.

The Transition Team asked some questions regarding restorative services and asked Mr. Beck to provide some clarification at the next meeting.

The participants wanted to know more about the history of the Senior Vision program and why there is not a parallel program for individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing. It was pointed out that this was apparently a political decision based in the late 1970's when Federal action established such services (started at \$3 million and is now up to \$33 million nationally). North Dakota is a "minimum allotment" state receiving \$225,000 per year, with a state match of 10%.

Participants were advised that there is not necessarily a VR staff member who has expertise and responsibility for services to individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing. Presently, Helen Baumgartner of the VR State Office (and a Transition Team member) is assigned co-responsibilities for issues of deafness/hearing impairment, and blindness/vision impairment.

There was discussion regarding whether or not any contractors/sub-contractors currently provide services to people who are deaf or hard of hearing. Although this approach is not used in North Dakota, James Johnson indicated that he would be willing to bring information from a friend who works for Communication Services for the Deaf (CSD) to examine that model and a template for contract services for the Transition Team to review.

- **History of the NDSD** – Carmen Grove Suminski, Superintendent, ND School for the Deaf, North Dakota Vision Services/School for the Blind
Due to time constraints, it was agreed that this presentation would be rescheduled to coincide with the meeting to be held at the NDSD.
- **Midwest Conference Report** – Nancy Skorheim, Carmen Suminski and Carol Lybeck
Due to time constraints, it was agreed that this presentation would be scheduled for a subsequent meeting.

Future Services Planning – The Challenge and Process

The Transition Team members reviewed the draft “profile” handout and discussed how much and what profile data needs to be collected. It was agreed that adequate information is already available from existing data sources for all of the profile groups and it would not be necessary to pursue any additional data. However, DPI was asked to provide the Hearing Impairment Among North Dakotans, 2005 Report (www.ndsu.edu/sdc) for all Transition Team members prior to the next meeting. The participants noted that there may be information missing regarding the services being provided to each age/profile group, and agreed that this material would be needed for the Transition Team to make an accurate determination regarding service gaps.

The Transition Team reviewed their role and the responsibilities they are charged with through HB 1013 and identified the following challenges:

- To identify a consensus vision of the continuum of services for all deaf and hard of hearing citizens, the related recommendations for how to achieve it, and, to the extent possible, the actions steps and activities needed for each recommendation.
 - The task of the Transition Team could be considered as a three piece pie:
 - The development of a plan to provide services to all individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing in the state;
 - Provide/Offer ongoing institutional/residential services to the (limited) students who will continue to need them; and
 - Develop ideas/suggestions for the potential (revenue generating) use of the vacant space at NDSD.
 - A suggested fourth piece of the pie was the provision of specialized support from the NDSD to students living in their home communities.
 - Explore the potential for providing/marketing services to other states, and/or special education units within North Dakota.
 - Consider the pros and cons of potentially separating young children from their families.
 - There will be philosophical differences regarding some decisions. The Transition Team will need to use the consensus process to overcome these and work through them.

- Cost benefit analysis must be determined for all deaf and hard of hearing students in the state regardless of where they are served (NDS and school districts).
- Fair comparisons and consistency with the needs (using real numbers) must be developed and employed throughout the process.
- Students enrolled at the NDS are paid for by state funds and do not cost the local school districts anything. This may be an incentive for local districts to make the decision to send students to NDS.
- The Transition Team needs more/better information regarding the services being provided to students in mainstream situation; i.e., How many students are being served? What is the quality level of the services? Do students have access to certified/qualified interpreters? Can this data be collected?
- Research from Gallaudet University shows that the most influential factor regarding positive outcomes for deaf and hard of hearing students is the quality of instruction.
- Consider the role of the NDS as a true statewide resource that provides information and direct outreach support to all service providers and functions as a direct service provider to consumers (particularly the aging population) when and where appropriate.
- To develop specific strategies to make a transition from “the vision” to “the reality” using a sound process and logical sequencing while maintaining quality and not repeating the mistakes of other facilities in other states.
 - The focus of plan should be implementation through a broad lens, including DHS, K-12 education, selling the recommendations to the Governor and legislators and the public.
- To be committed and positioned to move the plan and its recommendations from paper to reality by sharing the story, educating the public, engaging partners (including the legislature and the governor’s office) and leading each Transition Team member’s respective constituencies (the participants agreed that this challenge should be specifically added to the role of the Transition Team).
 - The Transition Team needs to anticipate and be prepared to address the tough questions that are likely to be asked.
 - Over time, the Transition Team will make proposals for moving forward and only then will the team be able to strategize how to get the leaders “on board” with the recommendations to gain additional support.
 - There is a hunger for doing something positive about the dilemma of the NDS and deaf education in the state.
 - Voting for something is not the same as fighting for something. The Transition Team must come out of the process with a passion for the plan and a willingness to promote its implementation.
 - This initiative is important to all of North Dakota, not just the community of Devils Lake or a particular sector of the population.

Identification of Additional Data, Information, and Education Materials/Presentations

1. DPI will provide electronic copies of *Hearing Impairment Among North Dakotans, 2005 Report* (www.ndsu.edu/sdc) for distribution with the draft meeting summary.
2. DPI will provide demographic information regarding all students in ND who are deaf or hard of hearing for discussion at the next meeting.
3. DPI will provide demographic information regarding all teachers who are qualified as teachers for individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing in the state. This will include standards and practices for their educational preparation and licensure for discussion at the next meeting.
4. DPI was asked to prepare and conduct a simple survey of all Special Education units to assess how many students actually have a secondary diagnosis of deafness or are hard of hearing.
5. The Transition Team requested a presentation/review regarding the continuum of services (focusing on adults) in the State of Minnesota (it was agreed that this could be accomplished through materials and would not necessarily require someone from Minnesota to present directly). Additionally, supplemental information may be included in the Midwest Conference Report (to be presented at a future meeting).
6. The Transition Team agreed that they would like to have more information and discussion regarding IPAT, the types of adaptive/supportive equipment they provide and any eligibility requirements or costs.

The participants indicated a desire to have some “social time” together and it was suggested that the Planning Team explore this possibility. Carmen Suminski invited the Transition Team her home on the grounds of the NDSD the evening prior to the next meeting.

Values/Principles (Transition Team Progressive Survey)

Transition Team members were asked to and completed the progressive survey.

Summary Comments

Transition Team members provided the following summary comments:

- The discussion was invigorating. We need to continue doing what we’re doing.
- We have begun dealing with the issues that we need to deal with. We need to look at this as a statewide plan.
- I like the road we are going on. I think we’re getting there.
- The rubber is beginning to hit the road.
- I’m excited and I think we can come out with a product none of us could have pictured at the beginning.
- We are beginning to recognize what the needs are.
- My position is that the best deaf education is to keep it the same. The best education for the children is still at NDSD. I have so much passion for this.

- I appreciate the openness and honesty and the high level of comfort in sharing views. This will help us to create a quality product that will receive wide-ranging support.
- The information presented regarding services to older adults (seniors) will be very helpful to us in our decision-making.
- I think there's lots of lip service about serving deaf kids, but not in this room. These people are sincere.
- It is humbling and rewarding to see the passion around this room. I see good things to come.
- Not quite as optimistic as the others. I'm not sure that the rubber is hitting the road, yet.
- I am excited and scared at the same time.

Public Comments and Input

There were no observers or guests from the public present at this meeting. No comments or input was provided.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by group consensus.

Next Meetings

Planning Team Meeting

Tuesday, November 24, 2009
10:00 a.m. to Noon
Bismarck, ND

Transition Team Meeting

Thursday, December 17, 2009
8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
Devils Lake, ND (tentative)